

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-9, 11, 13-16 and 40-53 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 9 being the independent claims. New claims 52 and 53 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry and is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 16, 40, 42-48, 50, and 51

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 16, 40, 42-48, 50, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2004/0148632 to Park et al. ("Park") in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0026528 to Lo ("Lo") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,805 to Harris et al. ("Harris"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features:

a remote interface configured to receive a remote control signal that includes a request for an action to be performed at one of the distributed electronic devices; . . .

a controller configured to generate management instructions to adjust the distributed electronic devices based on the action to be performed at the one of the distributed electronic devices and the device information.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the combination of Park and Lo fails to disclose the combination of these two features recited in claim 1:

The combined system of Park and Lo fails to disclose that the controller is configured to adjust a plurality of distributed electronic devices based on the action to be performed at a single one of the devices.

(Office Action, p. 4.) Harris does not cure the deficiency of Park and Lo.

Harris is directed to a state-based remote control system “utilized to control and operate various external electronic devices.” (Harris, 4:60-65.) Before the state-based remote control system can be used, the user must program the remote control to recognize all the external electronic devices to be controlled and the current “states” of each electronic devices (e.g., whether the electronic devices are currently on or off). (*See* Harris, 6:53-58.)

After the initial programming is completed, the state-based remote control system of Harris can be used to perform “actions” and “tasks.” An action, as defined by Harris, “is a specific event that ... affects one of the external devices.” (Harris, 7:28-29.) A task, on the other hand, is “comprised of one more actions”. (Harris, 7:40-43.) For an executed task to result in actions performed at multiple devices, the task must be comprised of multiple actions as disclosed by Harris. (*See* Harris, 8:50-60.)

In support of the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner cites to the “tasks” of Harris. Specifically, in regard to the “tasks” of Harris, the Examiner states that “Harris discloses adjusting a plurality of distributed electronic devices based on an action to be performed at a single one of the devices.” (Office Action, p. 4). However, a “task” configured to adjust multiple devices in Harris, is comprised of multiple actions. When executed, the “task” requests that the multiple actions be performed. In other words, Harris does *not* disclose a “task” that requests for an action to be performed at a single device with resultant adjustment of multiple devices based on the requested action.

Thus, Harris further does not teach or suggest “a remote interface configured to receive a remote control signal that includes *a request for an action to be performed at one of the distributed electronic devices*” and “adjust[ing] the distributed electronic devices *based on the action to be performed at the one of the distributed electronic devices* and the device information” as recited in claim 1¹. (Emphasis added.)

Because the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, they cannot render claim 1 unpatentable. Dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 46-48, 50, and 51 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris for the same reason as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 46-48, 50, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 recites, among other features, “receiving a remote control signal that includes a request for an action to be performed at one of the distributed electronic devices” and “generating management instructions to adjust the distributed electronic devices based on the action to be performed at the one of the electronic devices and the device information.” As noted above, in regard to claim 1, the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris does not teach or suggest at least these features. Therefore, the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris cannot render independent claim 9 unpatentable. Dependent claims 11, 16, 40, and 42-45 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris for at the same reasons as

¹ Applicants note that in the previous reply, dated May 26, 2009, Applicants inadvertently misquoted independent claims 1 and 9 by including the term “single.” However, Applicants submit that the term “single” was superfluous and did not change the scope of the claim because it was followed by the synonymous term “one.”

independent claim 9, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 9, 11, 16, 40, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 13-15

Claims 5 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park in view of Lo in view of Harris and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2005/0117052 to Willes et al. (“Willes”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Willes does not cure the deficiencies of Park, Lo, and Harris with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, as noted above. Dependent claims 5 and 13-15 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, Harris, and Willes for the same reason as claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 41 and 49

Claims 41 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park in view of Lo in view of Harris and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0227439 to Lee et al. (“Lee”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Lee does not cure the deficiencies of Park, Lo, and Harris with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, as noted above. Dependent claims 41 and 49 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, Harris, and Lee for the same reason as claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, and further in view of

their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 41 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 52 and 53 respectively depend from claims 1 and 9 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reason as claim 1 and 9, presented above, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of claims 52 and 53.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 11/24/09

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1003133_1.DOC